arXiv:1407.2062v3 [math.GT] 3 Dec 2014

SURFACE BUNDLES OVER SURFACES WITH ARBITRARILY MANY FIBERINGS

NICK SALTER

Abstract. In this paper we give the first example of a surface bundle over a surface with at least three fiberings. In fact, for each $n \geq 3$ we construct 4-manifolds E admitting at least n distinct fiberings $p_i : E \to \Sigma_{g_i}$ as a surface bundle over a surface with base and fiber both closed surfaces of negative Euler characteristic. We give examples of surface bundles admitting multiple fiberings for which the monodromy representation has image in the Torelli group, showing the necessity of all of the assumptions made in the main theorem of our recent paper [Sal14]. Our examples show that the number of surface bundle structures that can be realized on a 4-manifold E with Euler characteristic d grows exponentially with d.

1. Introduction

Let M^3 be a 3-manifold fibering over S^1 with fiber Σ_g ($g \geq 2$). If $b_1(M) \geq 2$, Thurston[1] showed that there are in fact infinitely many ways to express M as a surface bundle over S^1, with finitely many fibers of each genus $h \geq 2$ [Thu86]. In contrast, F.E.A. Johnson showed that every surface bundle over a surface $\Sigma_g \to E^4 \to \Sigma_h$ with $g, h \geq 2$ has at most finitely many fiberings (see [Joh99], [Hil02], [Riv11] or Proposition 3.1 for various accounts). It is possible to deduce from Johnson's work that there is a universal upper bound on the number of fiberings that any surface bundle over a surface E^4 can have, as a function of the Euler characteristic $\chi(E)$. Specifically, Proposition 3.1 shows that if E^4 satisfies $\chi(E) = 4d$, then E has at most $\sigma_0(d)(d+1)^{2d+6}$ fiberings as a surface bundle over a surface, where $\sigma_0(d)$ denotes the number of positive divisors of d.

The simplest example of a surface bundle over a surface with multiple fiberings[2] is that of a product $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_h$, which has the two projections onto the factors Σ_g and Σ_h. Prior to the results of this paper, there was essentially one general method for constructing nontrivial examples of surface bundles over surfaces with multiple fiberings, and they all yielded bundles with only two known fiberings (although it is in theory possible that these examples could admit

Date: December 4, 2014.

[1]While the theory of the Thurston norm gives the most complete picture of the ways in which a 3-manifold fibers over S^1, earlier examples of this phenomenon were found by J. Tollefson [Tol69] and D. Neumann [Neu76].

[2]In this paper, we consider two fiberings $p : E \to \Sigma_g$ and $q : E \to \Sigma_h$ to be equivalent if they are "π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphic", which is strictly stronger than fiberwise diffeomorphism. See Section 2 for the precise definition of π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism, and see Proposition 2.2, as well as Remark 2.4, for a discussion of why we adopt this convention.

three or more, cf Question 3.4). Such examples were first constructed by Atiyah and Kodaira (see [Ati69], [Kod67], as well as the account in [Mor01]), and proceeded by taking a fiberwise branched covering of particular "diagonally embedded" submanifolds of products of surfaces.

It is worth remarking that if one is willing to relax the requirement that both the base and fiber surface have negative Euler characteristic, then it is possible to construct examples of 4-manifolds E admitting infinitely many fibrations over the torus T^2. If M^3 is a 3-manifold admitting infinitely many fibrations over S^1, then $E = M^3 \times S^1$ has the required properties. However, Johnson's result indicates that when $g, h \geq 2$, the situation is necessarily much more rigid and correspondingly richer. The mechanism by which $E = M^3 \times S^1$ admits infinitely many fiberings is completely understood via the theory of the Thurston norm. In contrast, in the case $g, h \geq 2$, entirely new phenomena will necessarily occur.

This paucity of examples, combined with the interesting features of the known constructions, led to the author's interest in surface bundles over surfaces with multiple fiberings. In [Sal14], the author established the following theorem which shows a certain rigidity among a particular class of surface bundles over surfaces. Let Mod_g denote the mapping class group of the closed surface Σ_g, and let $\mathcal{I}_g$ denote the *Torelli group*, i.e. the subgroup of Mod_g that acts trivially on $H_1(\Sigma_g, \mathbb{Z})$. The *Johnson kernel* $\mathcal{K}_g$ is defined to be the subgroup of $\mathcal{I}_g$ generated by the set of Dehn twists about separating simple closed curves. Recall that the *monodromy* of a surface bundle $\Sigma_g \to E \to B$ is the homomorphism $\rho : \pi_1 B \to \mathrm{Mod}_g$ recording the mapping class of the diffeomorphism obtained by transporting a fiber around a loop in the base.

Theorem 1.1 (Uniqueness of fiberings: [Sal14], Theorem 1.2)**.** *Let $\pi : E \to B$ be a surface bundle over a surface with monodromy in the Johnson kernel $\mathcal{K}_g$. If E admits two distinct structures as a surface bundle over a surface then E is diffeomorphic to $B \times B'$, the product of the base spaces. In other words, any nontrivial surface bundle over a surface with monodromy in $\mathcal{K}_g$ fibers as a surface bundle in a unique way.*

This result would seem to reinforce the impression that surface bundles over surfaces with multiple fiberings are extremely rare, and that examples with three or more fiberings should be even more exotic. However, the constructions of this paper show that there is in fact a great deal of flexibility in constructing surface bundles over surfaces with many fiberings. The following is a summary of the constructions given in Section 2.

Theorem 1.2 (Existence of multiple fiberings)**.**

(1) *For each $n \geq 3$ and each $g_1 \geq 2$ there exists a 4-manifold E, integers $g_2, \ldots, g_n$, and maps $p_i : E \to \Sigma_{g_i} (i = 1, \ldots, n)$ realizing E as the total space of a surface bundle over a surface in at least n distinct ways.*
(2) *There exist constructions as in (1) for which at least one of the monodromy representations $\rho_i : \pi_1 \Sigma_{g_i} \to \mathrm{Mod}_{h_i}$ has image contained in the Torelli group $\mathcal{I}_{h_i} \leq \mathrm{Mod}_{h_i}$.*
(3) *There exists a sequence of surface bundles over surfaces E_n for which $\chi(E_n) = 24n - 8$ and such that E_n admits 2^n distinct fiberings as a surface bundle over a surface.*

The bound of Proposition 3.1 makes it sensible to define the following function:

$$N(d) := \max\{n \mid \text{there exists } E^4, \chi(E) \leq 4d,\ E \text{ admits } n \text{ distinct surface bundle structures.}\}$$

Phrased in these terms, (3) of Theorem 1.2, in combination with the upper bound of Proposition 3.1 implies that

$$2^{(d+2)/6} \leq N(d) \leq \sigma_0(d)(d+1)^{2d+6},$$

where $\sigma_0(d)$ denotes the number of positive divisors of d. This should be compared to the previous lower bound $N(d) \geq 2$.

An additional corollary of Theorem 1.2 is that it demonstrates the optimality of Theorem 1.1. The *Johnson filtration* is a natural filtration $\mathcal{I}_g(k)$ on Mod_g recording how mapping classes act on nilpotent quotients of $\pi_1\Sigma_g$. The first three terms in the filtration are given by $\mathcal{I}_g(1) = \mathrm{Mod}_g$, and $\mathcal{I}_g(2) = \mathcal{I}_g$, and $\mathcal{I}_g(3) = \mathcal{K}_g$. It follows from Theorem 1.2 (2) that Theorem 1.1 is optimal with respect to the Johnson filtration, in that there exist surface bundles over surfaces with multiple fiberings with monodromy contained in $\mathcal{I}_g$ and Mod_g.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Dan Margalit for extending an invitation to the 2014 Georgia Topology Conference where this project was begun, for bringing the Korkmaz construction to our attention and for other helpful discussions and comments. I would also like to thank Inanc Baykur, Jonathan Hillman, Andy Putman, and Bena Tshishiku for helpful conversations and suggestions. I would like to thank the referees for their detailed suggestions and corrections. Lastly I would like to thank Benson Farb for his continued support and guidance, as well as for extensive comments and corrections on this paper.

2. The examples

The basic construction. To illustrate our general method we start by describing a construction of a surface bundle over a surface E admitting four fiberings $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 : E \to \Sigma_g$. The monodromy of this bundle was first considered by Korkmaz[3], as an example of an embedding of a surface group inside the Torelli group. Related constructions were also used by Baykur and Margalit to construct Lefschetz fibrations that are not fiber-sums of holomorphic ones in [BM12]. For what follows it will be necessary to give a direct topological construction of the total space.

The method of construction is to perform a "section sum" of two surface bundles over surfaces (see [BM13] for a discussion of the section sum operation, including an equivalent description on the level of the monodromy representation). Let $\Sigma_{g_1} \to M_1 \to \Sigma_h$ and $\Sigma_{g_2} \to M_2 \to \Sigma_h$ be two surface bundles over a base space Σ_h, and for $i = 1, 2$ let $\sigma_i : \Sigma_h \to M_i$ be sections of M_1, M_2. If the Euler numbers of σ_1, σ_2 are equal up to sign, then it is possible to perform a fiberwise connect-sum of M_1, M_2 along tubular neighborhoods of $\mathrm{Im}(\sigma_i)$ (possibly after reversing orientation), giving rise to a surface bundle $\Sigma_{g_1+g_2} \to M \to \Sigma_h$. In what follows, we will give a

[3]Unpublished; communicated to the author by D. Margalit.

more detailed description of this construction and explain how it can be used to produce surface bundles over surfaces with many fiberings.

Remark 2.1. We have chosen to present an example here where all of the fiberings have the same genus. In fact, the four fiberings presented here are equivalent up to fiberwise diffeomorphism, but *not* up to π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism. We stress here that this is *not* an essential feature of the general method of construction described in the paper, but merely the simplest example which requires the least amount of cumbersome notation. See Remark 2.4 for more on why π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism is the correct notion of equivalence for our purposes, and see Theorem 2.12 for the most general method of construction, which can produce 4-manifolds that fiber as surface bundles in arbitrarily many ways with surfaces of distinct genera. It is worth noting that if E^4 fibers as a Σ_g-bundle and a Σ_h-bundle, for $g \neq h$, then clearly these two fiberings are distinct, up to bundle isomorphism, fiberwise diffeomorphism, or π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism, since the fibers are not even homeomorphic!

For $g \geq 2$, consider the product bundle $E_1 = \Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g$ with projection maps $p_V, p_H : E_1 \to \Sigma_g$ onto the first (resp. second) factor. Let N be an open tubular neighborhood of the diagonal Δ. The manifold E is then constructed as the double

$$E = (E_1 \setminus N) \cup_{\partial \overline{N}} (E_1 \setminus N),$$

where the boundary components ∂N are identified via the identity map. We let E^+, E^- denote the "upper" and "lower" copies of $E_1 \setminus N$ contained in E. See Figure 1.

E is equipped with four fiberings $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 : E \to \Sigma_g$. These correspond to the four combinations of horizontal and vertical fiberings on E^+ and E^-. For each p_i, we will exhibit collar neighborhoods of $\partial E^{\pm}$ relative to which the given p_i will be smooth.

To describe these collar neighborhoods, we will work in convenient coordinates. Endow Σ_g with the structure of a translation surface, i.e. identify Σ_g with some Riemann surface X equipped with a nonzero holomorphic 1-form ω. Relative to this, there is an atlas $\mathcal{A} = \{\phi_\alpha\}$ where each $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \mathbb{C}$ identifies some open subset U_α of Σ_g with some subset of $\mathbb{C}$, and the transition functions $\phi_\beta \circ \phi_\alpha^{-1}$ are all translations of the form $z \mapsto z + c$.

$\mathcal{A}$ induces coordinates on $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g$ via $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} = \{\phi_\alpha \times \phi_\beta\}$. Relative to this, there is a parameterization of a neighborhood of Δ via $\{\phi_\alpha \times \phi_\alpha\}$. If ε is suitably small, then N is parameterized in these coordinates via

$$(\phi_\alpha \times \phi_\alpha)(N \cap (U_\alpha \times U_\alpha)) = \{(z, w) \mid |z - w| < \varepsilon\}.$$

This (and all further constructions in coordinates to come) is independent of the choice of α by virtue of the fact that all transition functions are translations. The boundary $\partial \overline{N}$ is



FIGURE 1. A cartoon rendering of E, depicted as shaded. The boundaries are identified.

parameterized via

$$\begin{aligned}(\phi_\alpha \times \phi_\alpha)(\partial\overline{N} \cap (U_\alpha \times U_\alpha)) &= \{(z,w) \mid |z-w| = \varepsilon\} \\ &= \{(z, z+\varepsilon e^{i\theta}) \mid \theta \in [0,2\pi)\} \\ &= \{(z-\varepsilon e^{i\theta}, z) \mid \theta \in [0,2\pi)\}.\end{aligned}$$

p_1 is defined using the vertical projection p_V on each component. A suitable collar neighborhood (on either component) is given locally (for $t \in [1,2)$) by

$$\theta_V(z,\varepsilon,t) = (z, z+t\varepsilon e^{i\theta}).$$

Similarly p_2 is defined using the horizontal projection p_H on each component. A suitable collar neighborhood of either boundary component is now given locally (again for $t \in [1,2)$) by

$$\theta_H(z,\varepsilon,t) = (z-t\varepsilon e^{i\theta}, z).$$

The remaining projections p_3, p_4 are defined using p_V on one component and p_H on the other. To realize these as smooth maps it will be necessary to modify the choice of boundary identification made in the construction of E. Consider the isotopy $h_t : \partial\overline{N} \times [0,1] \to \partial\overline{N}$ given locally by

$$h_t(z, z+\varepsilon e^{i\theta}) = (z-t\varepsilon e^{i\theta}, z+(1-t)\varepsilon e^{i\theta}).$$

As $h_0 = \mathrm{id}$, there is a diffeomorphism

$$f : E \to (E_1 \setminus N) \cup_{h_1} (E_1 \setminus N).$$

p_3 is defined on $(E_1 \setminus N) \cup_{h_1} (E_1 \setminus N)$ using p_V on the first component and p_H on the second. Note that

$$p_V(z, z + \varepsilon e^{i\theta}) = (p_H \circ h_1)(z, z + \varepsilon e^{i\theta}) = z,$$

so p_3 is well-defined. Moreover, p_3 is smooth relative to the collar neighborhoods θ_V on the first component and θ_H on the second.

Completely analogously, p_4 is defined on $(E_1 \setminus N) \cup_{h_1} (E_1 \setminus N)$ using p_H on the first component and p_V on the second. See Figures 2 and 3 for some depictions of the fibering p_4.

It is clear that each p_i is a proper surjective submersion; consequently by Ehresmann's theorem each p_i realizes E as the total space of a fiber bundle. In each case the base space is Σ_g, while the fiber is $\Sigma_g \# \Sigma_g \cong \Sigma_{2g}$.

We next recall the notion of π_1-*fiberwise diffeomorphism* from [Sal14]. We say that two fiberings $p_1 : E \to B_1$, $p_2 : E \to B_2$ of a surface bundle are π_1-*fiberwise diffeomorphic* if

(1) The bundles $p_1 : E \to B_1$ and $p_2 : E \to B_2$ are fiberwise diffeomorphic. That is, there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\phi} & E \\ {\scriptstyle p_1}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p_2} \\ B_1 & \xrightarrow[\alpha]{} & B_2 \end{array}$$

with ϕ, α diffeomorphisms.

(2) The induced map ϕ_* preserves $\pi_1 F_1$, i.e. $\phi_*(\pi_1 F_1) = \pi_1 F_1$ (here, as always, F_i denotes a fiber of p_i).

In [Sal14], we gave the following criterion for two bundle structures to be distinct up to π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphisms (Proposition 2.1 of that paper):

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose E is the total space of a surface bundle over a surface in two ways: $p_1 : E \to B_1$ and $p_2 : E \to B_2$. Let F_1, F_2 denote fibers of p_1, p_2 respectively. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *The fiberings p_1, p_2 are π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphic.*
(2) *The fiber subgroups $\pi_1 F_1, \pi_1 F_2 \leq \pi_1 E$ are equal.*

If $\deg(p_1 \times p_2) \neq 0$ then the bundle structures p_1 and p_2 are distinct.

With this characterization in mind, we will establish the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *The fiberings $p_i : E \to \Sigma_g$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ constructed above are pairwise distinct up to π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphisms.*



FIGURE 2. The fibering $p_4 : E \to \Sigma_g$. The fiber over $w \in \Sigma_g$ is shaded. On the upper portion of the bundle it intersects each of the p_V-fibers in a single point.

Proof. To show that the projections p_i as defined are pairwise distinct, we will appeal to condition (2) of Proposition 2.2. For each i, the long exact sequence in homotopy of a fibration reduces to a short exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \pi_1 F_i \longrightarrow \pi_1 E \xrightarrow{p_{i,*}} \pi_1 \Sigma_g \longrightarrow 1.$$

To show that $\pi_1 F_i$ and $\pi_1 F_j$ are distinct for distinct i, j, it therefore suffices to produce an element $x \in \pi_1 F_i$ such that $p_{j,*}(x) \neq 1$ in $\pi_1 \Sigma_g$. Let i and j be distinct. Without loss of generality, suppose that p_i is defined via p_V on E^+, while p_j is defined on E^+ via p_H. Let F_i and F_j denote generic fibers of p_i, p_j respectively. Both of $F_i \cap E^+$ and $F_j \cap E^+$ are homeomorphic to Σ_g^1, the surface of genus g and one boundary component.

Let $\gamma \subset \Sigma_g^1$ be a non-peripheral loop representing a nontrivial element of $\pi_1 \Sigma_g^1$, and identify γ with a loop in F_i. Then $[\gamma] \in \pi_1 F_i$ by construction (and is nontrivial), while $p_j(\gamma) = p_H(\gamma) = \gamma$. Here γ is viewed as a loop in Σ_g under the natural inclusion of Σ_g^1. As γ was chosen to be non-peripheral and essential in Σ_g^1, it remains homotopically nontrivial in Σ_g. It follows that $\pi_1 F_i$ and $\pi_1 F_j$ are distinct for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Per Proposition 2.2, p_i and p_j are not π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphic as claimed. □



FIGURE 3. A second cartoon sketch of the fibering p_4.

Remark 2.4. As remarked above, the four fiberings constructed above are in fact fiberwise diffeomorphic, by applying factor-swapping involutions $(x, y) \to (y, x)$ on one or more of the components $E^{\pm}$. This same phenomenon appears for trivial bundles $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_h$. When $g \neq h$ the projections onto the first and second factors clearly yield inequivalent bundles, as the fibers are not even the same manifold. On the other hand, when $g = h$, the factor-swapping involution yields a bundle isomorphism between the horizontal and vertical projections of $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g$. However, in both of these examples the fiberings are not π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphic. Moreover, Proposition 2.2 shows that π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism is equivalent to the natural notion of equivalence on the group-theoretic level. For this reason, we believe that π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism is the correct notion of equivalence for surface bundles over surfaces. By using the techniques of Theorem 2.12, one can construct surface bundles over surfaces with arbitrarily many fiberings for which the fibers all have distinct genera, and therefore certainly give examples of bundles where the fiberings are not fiberwise diffeomorphic.

Remark 2.5. Via the Seifert-van Kampen theorem, it is possible to compute

$$\pi_1 E \cong \Gamma *_{\pi_1 UT\Sigma_g} \Gamma, \tag{1}$$

where $\Gamma = \pi_1(\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g \setminus N)$ and $UT\Sigma_g$ denotes the unit tangent bundle. Let

$$\varpi_1 : \Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g \setminus N \to \Sigma_g$$

denote the vertical projection, and define ϖ_2 similarly as the horizontal projection. Relative to the isomorphism of (1), the induced maps of the four fiberings $(p_i)_* : \pi_1 E \to \pi_1 \Sigma_g$ correspond to the four amalgamations $(\varpi_i)_* * (\varpi_j)_* : \Gamma *_{\pi_1 UT\Sigma_g} \Gamma \to \pi_1 \Sigma_g$.

As remarked above, the bundle $p_1 : E \to \Sigma_g$ was originally considered by Korkmaz (see Footnote 1 of [BM12]), who constructed its monodromy representation as an example of an embedding $\rho : \pi_1 \Sigma_g \to \mathcal{I}_{2g}$. We now give a description of this embedding. Let Mod_g^1 denote the mapping class of a surface with one boundary component (where as usual the isotopies are required to fix the boundary component pointwise). We will denote this boundary curve by η. Consider the embedding

$$\begin{aligned} f : \pi_1(UT(\Sigma_g)) &\to \mathrm{Mod}_g^1 \times \mathrm{Mod}_g^1 \\ \alpha &\mapsto (\mathrm{Push}(\alpha), F^{-1} \circ \mathrm{Push}(\alpha) \circ F), \end{aligned}$$

where $F : \Sigma_g^1 \to \Sigma_g^1$ is any orientation-reversing diffeomorphism. Compose this with the map

$$h : \mathrm{Mod}_g^1 \times \mathrm{Mod}_g^1 \to \mathrm{Mod}_{2g}$$

obtained by juxtaposing the mapping classes (x, y) on the two halves of Σ_{2g}. Let $\gamma \in \pi_1(UT(\Sigma_g))$ denote the loop around the circle fiber in $UT\Sigma_g$ in the positive direction as specified by the orientation on Σ_g. The map $\mathrm{Push}(\gamma) \in \mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma_g^1)$ corresponds to a positive twist about η. We claim that $h(f(\gamma)) = \mathrm{id}$. Indeed, the notion of "positive" twist is relative to a choice of orientation, and after the boundary components of the two copies of Σ_g^1 have been identified, the two twists correspond to a positive and negative twist about η, and so the result is isotopic to the identity.

The element $\gamma \in \pi_1(UT(\Sigma_g))$ generates a normal subgroup, and the quotient $\pi_1(UT(\Sigma_g))/\langle\gamma\rangle \approx \pi_1 \Sigma_g$. Therefore, we arrive at an embedding $\rho : \pi_1 \Sigma_g \to \mathrm{Mod}_{2g}$ as follows.



Lemma 2.6. *The image of ρ is contained in the Torelli group $\mathcal{I}_{2g}$.*

Proof. Let $\{\alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_g, \beta_g\}$ be a collection of simple closed curves for which the homology classes $\{[\alpha_1], \ldots, [\beta_g]\}$ comprise a generating set for $H_1(\Sigma_g^1)$. Let $F : \Sigma_g^1 \to \Sigma_g^1$ be the orientation-reversing map in the definition of f. We can then view Σ_{2g} as $\Sigma_g^1 \cup_{\partial \Sigma_g^1} F(\Sigma_g^1)$. Define

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \beta_g, F(\alpha_1), \ldots, F(\beta_g)\}.$$

It follows that the homology classes $\{[\alpha_1], \dots, [\beta_g], [F(\alpha_1)], \dots, [F(\beta_g)]\}$ comprise a generating set for $H_1(\Sigma_{2g})$. To determine whether a mapping class $\phi \in \mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma_{2g})$ is contained in $\mathcal{I}_{2g}$, it suffices to show that the homology class of each $\alpha_i, \beta_i, F(\alpha_i), F(\beta_i)$ is preserved by ϕ. Up to isotopy, η is preserved by the action of $\pi_1\Sigma_g$ via ρ, so it suffices to consider how $\pi_1\Sigma_g$ acts on both copies of Σ_g^1. If $x \in \pi_1\Sigma_g$ is given, then on Σ_g^1, the effect of $\rho(x)$ is to push the boundary component around a loop in Σ_g in the homotopy class of x. As is well-known (see, for example, [FM12], section 6.5.2), the curves η and $\rho(x)(\eta)$ are homologous, for any choice of $x \in \pi_1\Sigma_g$ and η a simple closed curve on Σ_g^1. In particular,

$$[\rho(x)(\alpha_1)] = [\alpha_1], \dots, [\rho(x)(\beta_g)] = [\beta_g],$$

where these homologies hold in Σ_g^1 and so necessarily also in Σ_{2g}. The element $x \in \pi_1\Sigma_g$ acts on the other half of Σ_{2g} via conjugation by F, and so similarly the curves $F(\alpha_1), \dots, F(\beta_g)$ are preserved on the level of homology. As we have shown that each homology class of a generating set for $H_1(\Sigma_{2g})$ is preserved under $\mathrm{Im}(\rho)$, it follows that $\mathrm{Im}(\rho) \leq \mathcal{I}_{2g}$ as claimed. □

Theorem 2.7. *The monodromy of any of the surface bundle structures $p_i : E \to \Sigma_g$ $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ is the map $\rho : \pi_1\Sigma_g \to \mathcal{I}_{2g}$ described above.*

Proof. We begin by considering p_1. Let $x \in \pi_1\Sigma_g$ be given. The image of the monodromy representation $\mu(x) \in \mathrm{Mod}_{2g}$ is computed by selecting some immersed representative γ for x, considering the pullback of the bundle $E \to \Sigma_g$ along the immersion map $S^1 \to \Sigma_g$ specified by γ, and determining the monodromy of this fibered 3-manifold.

The bundle $p_1 : E \to \Sigma_g$ is constructed so that the fiber over $w \in \Sigma_g$ consists of two disjoint copies of Σ_g connect-summed along disks centered at w. This means that as one traverses a loop $\gamma \subset \Sigma_g$, the effect of the monodromy is to drag the cylinder connecting the two halves along the loops in either half corresponding to γ. As a mapping class, this is exactly the map $\rho(x)$ described above.

Now let $\pi_1 E = \Gamma *_{\pi_1 UT\Sigma_g} \Gamma$ as in Remark 2.5. There is an involution $\iota : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ induced from the factor-swapping map on $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g \setminus \nu(\Delta)$. Let ϖ_1, ϖ_2 denote the vertical (resp. horizontal) projection $\Sigma_g \times \Sigma_g \setminus (\nu(\Delta)) \to \Sigma_g$. Then $(\varpi_i)_* \circ \iota = (\varpi_{i+1})_*$ for $i = 1, 2$ interpreted mod 2. As ι preserves $\pi_1 UT\Sigma_g$, it can be extended to an automorphism of either factor of $\pi_1 E = \Gamma *_{\pi_1 UT\Sigma_g} \Gamma$. In other words, the four surface-by-surface group extension structures on $\pi_1 E$ are in the same orbit of the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\pi_1 E)$. Consequently, the monodromy representations $r : \pi_1\Sigma_g \to \mathrm{Out}(\pi_1\Sigma_{2g})$ are the same. As r is identified with the topological monodromy representation $\rho : \pi_1\Sigma_g \to \mathrm{Mod}_{2g}$ under the Dehn-Nielsen-Baer isomorphism $\mathrm{Mod}_{2g} \approx \mathrm{Out}^+(\pi_1\Sigma_{2g})$, this shows that any of the four monodromy representations are equal. □

We summarize the results of the basic construction in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.8. *For any $g \geq 2$, there exists a 4-manifold E which admits four fiberings $p_i : E \to \Sigma_g, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ as a Σ_{2g}-bundle over Σ_g that are pairwise distinct up to π_1-fiberwise*



FIGURE 4. An example of a graph X equipped with a labeling of the half-edges by elements of $G = \mathbb{Z}/3 \approx \{1, \omega, \omega^2\}$ the group of third roots of unity.

diffeomorphism. For each i, the monodromy $\rho_i : \pi_1\Sigma_g \to \mathrm{Mod}_{2g}$ of $p_i : E \to \Sigma_g$ is contained in the Torelli group $\mathcal{I}_{2g}$.

Surface bundles over surfaces with n distinct fiberings. We next extend the construction given in the previous subsection to yield examples of surface bundles over surfaces with n distinct fiberings for arbitrary n. Let X be a connected bipartite graph with vertex set $V(X)$ and edge set $E(X)$ of cardinalities C, D respectively. As X is bipartite, it admits a coloring $c : V(X) \to \{+, -\}$ in such a way that if v is colored with $\pm$, then all the vertices w adjacent to v are colored $\mp$. Consequently we define $\delta^{\pm} : E(X) \to V(X)$ be the map which sends e to the vertex $v \in e$ colored $\pm$.

Let G be a finite group with $|G| = n$, where n is an integer such that every $v \in V(X)$ has valence at most n. Assign labelings $g^{\pm} : E(X) \to G$ to the half-edges of X, subject to the restriction that $g^{\pm}$ is an injection when restricted to

$$\{e \in E(X) \mid \delta^{\pm}(e) = v\}$$

for any $v \in V(X)$. In other words, the set of half-edges adjacent to any vertex must have distinct labelings. See Figure 4.

Let Σ be a surface admitting a free action of G, such as the one depicted in Figure 5. For each $v \in V(X)$, consider the 4-manifold $E_1^v = \Sigma \times \Sigma$, oriented so that the orientations on E_1^v and E_1^w disagree whenever $c(v) \neq c(w)$. Each E_1^v admits two projections $p^{v,1}, p^{v,2} : E_1^v \to \Sigma_g$ onto the first (resp. second) factor.

For $x \in G$, let

$$\Delta^x = \{(w, x \cdot w) \mid w \in \Sigma\} \subset \Sigma \times \Sigma$$



FIGURE 5. A surface Σ admitting a free action of $G = \{1, \omega, \omega^2\}$. With respect to the labeling in Figure 4, the fiber of E_2^a over $x \in \Sigma$ has neighborhoods of $x, \omega \cdot x$, and $\omega^2 \cdot x$ removed.

be the graph of $x : \Sigma \to \Sigma$. By abuse of notation we can view Δ^x as embedded in any of the E_1^v. Let Δ be the disconnected surface embedded in $E_1 = \bigcup_{v \in V(X)} E_1^v$ for which

$$\Delta \cap E_1^v = \bigcup_{v \in e} \Delta^{g^{c(v)}(e)}.$$

Let N denote the ε-neighborhood of Δ. There is a decomposition

$$N = \bigcup_{e \in E(X)} N^e$$

and a further decomposition

$$N^e = N^{e,+} \cup N^{e,-} \qquad \text{with} \qquad N^{e,\pm} \subset E_1^{\delta^{\pm}(e)}.$$

Each $N^{e,\pm}$ is the ε-neighborhood of a single component of Δ.

Define

$$E_2 = E_1 \setminus \mathrm{int}(N)$$

and, for $v \in V(X)$,

$$E_2^v = E_2 \cap E_1^v.$$

The orientation convention ensures that for each $e \in E$, the Euler numbers of the disk bundles $N^{e,\pm}$ are given by $\pm\chi(\Sigma)$. Their boundaries can therefore be identified via an orientation-reversing diffeomorphism. As in the previous construction, it will be convenient to specify the gluing maps only up to isotopy, and as before we will take the isotopy class of the identity.



FIGURE 6. A schematic rendering of the 4-manifold E_X associated to the graph X of Figure 4 and the surface Σ of Figure 5. The lines connecting the components indicate how the various $\tilde{N}^e$ are attached.

With these conventions in place, we define the (connected oriented) 4-manifold

$$E_X = \bigcup_{v \in V(X)} E_2^v$$

glued together as prescribed by the labeled graph X with all identifications of boundary components in the isotopy class of the identity. Figure 5 depicts a portion of the fiber of E_X for the graph X of Figure 4. Figure 6 depicts the total space of E_X. The portion of the fiber shown in Figure 5 is the portion contained in the central component of Figure 6.

Theorem 2.9. *Let X be a finite bipartite graph, possibly with multiple edges, with vertex set $V(X)$ and edge set $E(X)$ of cardinalities C, D respectively. Then,*

(1) *The manifold E_X constructed above admits 2^C distinct fiberings $p^f : E \to \Sigma$ as a surface bundle over a surface, indexed by the set of maps $f : V(X) \to \{1, 2\}$.*

(2) *The fiber of any of the fiberings is a surface of the form* $\tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma^{\#C}\#\Sigma_{1-C+D}$.
(3) *The total space* E_X *has the structure of a graph of groups modeled on* X *where the vertex groups are free-by-surface group extensions* Γ *and the edge groups are given by* $\pi_1 UT\Sigma$ *(with notation as in Remark 2.5).*

Proof. Given $f : V(X) \to \{1, 2\}$, define p^f on each component E_2^v via $p^{v,f(v)}$. To realize p^f as a smooth map, it is necessary to specify gluing maps identifying the various components of E_2, as well as appropriate collar neighborhoods. We proceed exactly as in Theorem 2.8. For each $x \in G$, there is an identification of (neighborhoods of) Δ^x with Δ^1 via the action of the diffeomorphism $\mathrm{id} \times x^{-1}$ of $\Sigma \times \Sigma$. Relative to these identifications, we will speak of identifying $\partial(N^{e,+})$ and $\partial(N^{e,-})$ via id or by h_1 as in Theorem 2.8. Likewise, we will speak of the collar neighborhoods θ_1 and θ_2 of $\partial(N^{e,\pm})$ (referred to as θ_V and θ_H respectively in Theorem 2.8).

The identifications are indexed via $E(X)$. As in Theorem 2.8, identify $\partial(N^{e,+})$ and $\partial(N^{e,-})$ via id if $f(\delta^+(e)) = f(\delta^-(e))$ and via h_1 otherwise. Then a collar neighborhood of $\partial(N^{e,\pm})$ for which p^f is smooth is given by $\theta_{f(\delta^\pm(e))}$.

The argument that each of the fiberings are distinct proceeds along the same lines as in Theorem 2.3. If $f_1, f_2 : V(X) \to \{1, 2\}$ are distinct, then there exists at least one v for which $f_1(v) \neq f_2(v)$. Arguing as in Theorem 2.3, one produces an essential loop $\gamma \subset E_2^v$ contained in the fiber of f_1 that projects onto an essential loop under f_2.

By definition, a graph of groups on a graph X is constructed by connecting Eilenberg-Maclane spaces $K(\Gamma_v, 1)$ indexed by the vertices, along mapping cylinders induced from homomorphisms $\phi_e : \Gamma_e \to \Gamma_v$. In our setting, for each $v \in V(X)$, the space E_2^v is a $K(\pi_1 E_2^v, 1)$ space, since it is the total space of a fibration $\Sigma' \to E_2^v \to \Sigma$, where Σ' is obtained from Σ by removing n open disks, one for each edge incident to v. As the base and the fiber of this fibration are both aspherical, it follows from the homotopy long exact sequence that E_2^v is aspherical as well. The edge spaces are given by $\partial(N^{e,\pm})$, each of which is diffeomorphic to the aspherical space $UT\Sigma$. It follows that E_X is indeed a graph of groups. □

Remark 2.10. In contrast with the construction in Theorem 2.8, the monodromy representations associated to an arbitrary E_X need not be contained in the Torelli group. For example, let X be a graph with two vertices and two edges connecting them. We can take Σ to be a surface of genus 3. Then it is easy to find elements of the monodromy that do not preserve the homology of the fiber. See Figure 7.

It can also be seen from this point of view that the images of the monodromy representations will be contained in the *Lagrangian mapping class group* $\mathcal{L}_g$, defined as follows. The algebraic intersection pairing endows $H_1(\Sigma_g, \mathbb{Z})$ with a symplectic structure, and there is a decomposition

$$H_1(\Sigma_g, \mathbb{Z}) = L_x \oplus L_y$$

as a direct sum, with the property that the algebraic intersection pairing restricts trivially to L_x and to L_y. Then

$$\mathcal{L}_g := \{f \in \mathrm{Mod}_g \mid f(L_x) = L_x\}.$$



FIGURE 7. The lighter curve is taken to the darker one under the monodromy action associated to the loop on the base surface. The dark and the light curves are not homologous. The identifications of the boundary components have been indicated by cylinders.

Suppose $\tilde{\Sigma}$ has been constructed from a finite graph X as in Theorem 2.9. Let $\rho : \pi_1\Sigma \to \mathrm{Mod}(\tilde{\Sigma})$ be the associated monodromy. There is a Lagrangian subspace of $H_1(\tilde{\Sigma})$ of the form

$$L = \bigoplus_{v \in V(X)} L_v \oplus \mathcal{C},$$

where L_v is a Lagrangian subspace of the fiber of E_2^v, and $\mathcal{C} \leq H_1(\tilde{\Sigma})$ is the (possibly empty) subspace generated by the homology classes of the former boundary components in $\tilde{\Sigma}$. By construction, for all $x \in L_v$ and all $g \in \pi_1(\Sigma)$, the equation

$$\rho(g)(x) = x + c$$

holds in $H_1(\tilde{\Sigma})$, for some appropriate $c \in \mathcal{C}$. As $\mathcal{C}$ is fixed elementwise by the action of ρ, it follows that L is indeed a ρ-invariant Lagrangian subspace.

In [Sak12], Sakasai showed that the first MMM class $e_1 \in H^2(\mathrm{Mod}_g, \mathbb{Z})$ vanishes when restricted to $\mathcal{L}_g$. It follows that the surface bundles over surfaces constructed in this section all have signature zero. More generally, suppose $\Sigma_g \to E \to \Sigma_h$ is a surface bundle over a surface with monodromy representation $\rho : \pi_1\Sigma_h \to \Gamma$, where $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Mod}_g$ is a subgroup. We can view the bundle $E \to \Sigma_h$ as giving rise to a homology class $[E] \in H_2(\Gamma, \mathbb{Z})$, e.g. by taking the pushforward $\rho_*([\Sigma_h])$ of the fundamental class.

Question 2.11. *Do the examples of surface bundles over surfaces given in Theorem 2.9 determine nonzero classes in $\mathcal{L}_g$? For a fixed g, what is the dimension of the space spanned in $H_2(\mathcal{L}_g, \mathbb{Q})$ by the examples in Theorem 2.9 with fiber genus g?*

Further constructions. It is possible to extend the constructions in Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.9 to obtain examples where the base and fibers of distinct fiberings do not all have the same genus. The author is grateful to D. Margalit for suggesting the basic idea underlying the constructions in this subsection.

Theorem 2.12. *Let Σ be a surface admitting a free action by a finite group G of order n, let X be a connected bipartite graph of maximal valence n, and let $f^v : \tilde{\Sigma} \to \Sigma^v$ for $v \in V(X)$ be covering maps, not necessarily distinct. Then there exists a 4-manifold E_X admitting $|V(X)|+1$ fiberings $p^0, p^v (v \in V(X))$, with $p^0 : E_X \to \Sigma$ and $p^v : E_X \to \Sigma^v$ all projection maps for pairwise-distinct surface bundle structures on E.*

Proof. Let Σ^0 be a closed surface of genus g that admits coverings $f^1 : \Sigma^0 \to \Sigma^1$ and $f^2 : \Sigma^0 \to \Sigma^2$ of degree d_1, d_2 respectively. For $i = 1, 2$, consider the graphs $\Gamma_i \subset \Sigma^0 \times \Sigma^i$ of the coverings f^i. Thicken these to tubular neighborhoods N^i. Each ∂N^i is an S^1-bundle over Σ^0 with Euler number $\chi(\Sigma^0)$. By reversing the orientation on one of the components, it is therefore possible to fiberwise connect-sum $\Sigma^0 \times \Sigma^1$ and $\Sigma^0 \times \Sigma^2$ along N^1 and N^2 to make the 4-manifold E.

Let $p_V : E_2 \to \Sigma^0$ and $p_H^i : E_2^i \to \Sigma^i$ be the vertical and horizontal projections. These can be combined in various ways to define three distinct fiberings on E. The first fibering $p_0 : E \to \Sigma^0$ is given by the projection onto the first factor on both coordinates of E_2, so that the fiber is $\Sigma^1 \# \Sigma^2$. The second fibering $p_1 : E \to \Sigma^1$ is given by p_H^1 on E_2^1, and by $f^1 \circ p_V$ on E_2^2. Let F_1 denote the fiber of p_1 over $w \in \Sigma^1$. Then (relative to an appropriate metric d and a suitable $\varepsilon > 0$)

$$F_1 \cap E_2^1 = \{(y, w) \in \Sigma^0 \times \Sigma^1 \mid d(f^1(y), w) \geq \varepsilon\}$$

is a copy of Σ^0 with d_1 disks removed (recall that d_i is the degree of the covering $f^i : \Sigma^0 \to \Sigma^i$). In turn,

$$F_1 \cap E_2^2 = \{(v, y) \in \Sigma^0 \times \Sigma^2 \mid f^1(v) = w, d(f^2(v), y) \geq \varepsilon\}$$

consists of d_1 copies of Σ^2, each with one boundary component. In total then,

$$F_1 = \Sigma^0 \# \left(\Sigma^2\right)^{\# d_1}.$$

When $d_1 > 1$, the monodromy of p_1 is not contained in the Torelli group $\mathcal{I}_g$. Let γ be a loop on Σ^1 which lifts to an arc $\tilde{\gamma} \subset \Sigma^0$ with endpoints v_1, v_2. Then the component of $F_1 \cap E_2^2$ lying over $v_1 \in \Sigma^0$ is sent to the component lying over v_2. If x is a loop in the first component representing some nontrivial homology class in F_1, then $\rho(\gamma)(x)$ is a distinct homology class in F_1, and so the monodromy of p_1 has a nontrivial action on $H_1(\Sigma_g, \mathbb{Z})$.

The construction of $p_2 : E \to \Sigma^2$ is completely analogous. The fibering p_2 is given by $f^2 \circ p_V$ on E_2^1 and by p_H^2 on E_2^2. The fiber is of the form

$$F_2 = \Sigma^0 \# \left(\Sigma^1\right)^{\# d_2}.$$

As in the previous constructions it is necessary to specify the precise identification maps as well as collar neighborhoods. The internal details proceed along similar lines as before, except that the boundary identifications require some further comment. Realize ∂N^i as a subset of $\Sigma^0 \times \Sigma^i$. Then ∂N^i is the total space of two different fiber bundle structures inherited respectively from p_V and p_H^i. The identification maps for the various p_i will be constructed so as to preserve fibers of these various fiberings.

For p_0, identify ∂N^1 and ∂N^2 in a fiber-preserving way with respect to p_V on both ∂N_1 and ∂N_2. For p_1, identify ∂N^1 and ∂N^2 so that p_H^1-fibers on ∂N_1 correspond to p_V-fibers ∂N_2. More precisely, given $z \in \Sigma^1 1$, the p_H^1-fiber of z consists of d_1 disjoint circles projecting down to circles in Σ^0 centered at the points of $(f^1)^{-1}(z)$. For every $x \in \Sigma^0$, the identification of ∂N_1 and ∂N_2 identifies $p_V^{-1}(x)$ with the component of $(p_H^1)^{-1}(f^1(x))$ centered over x. The identification of $\partial N^1, \partial N^2$ appropriate for p_3 is constructed analogously, matching p_V-fibers of ∂N_1 with p_H^2-fibers of ∂N_2.

The straight-line isotopy h_t constructed in the course of Theorem 2.8 was purely local in its definition. The same formulas as before show that the three gluing maps constructed in the above paragraph are mutually isotopic, and the construction proceeds as before.

It is also possible to generalize the construction of Theorem 2.9, so that the surfaces used in the construction of E_X are all covered by Σ. For $v \in V(X)$, let $f^v : \Sigma \to \Sigma_v$ be a covering. Suppose that each Σ_v admits a free action of a group G_v, such that $|G_v|$ is at least the valence of v. We may then repeat the construction of Theorem 2.9, taking $E_1^v = \Sigma \times \Sigma_v$. Since G_v acts freely, for $g, h \in G_v$, the graphs of $g \circ f^v$ and $h \circ f^v$ are disjoint as submanifolds of E_1^v. We may then remove neighborhoods of these graphs to produce E_2^v and connect the boundaries as in Theorem 2.9. The resulting E_X has at least $|V(X)| + 1$ distinct fiberings $p_0, p_v (v \in V(X))$. The first fibering p_0 is defined on each E_2^v via p_V, and the result is a fiber bundle $p_0 : E_X \to \Sigma$. For $v \in V(X)$, define p_v on the components E_2^v via

$$p_v|_{E_2^w} \begin{cases} p_H^v & w = v \\ f^v \circ p_V & w \neq v. \end{cases}$$

The result is a fibering $p_v : E_X \to \Sigma^v$. □

Example 2.13. Let Σ be a surface admitting a free action of $\mathbb{Z}/2^n$ for some n. For $0 \leq k \leq n$ define $\Sigma^k = \Sigma/(\mathbb{Z}/2^k)$. Let $f^k : \Sigma \to \Sigma^k$ be the associated covering. Each Σ^k admits an action of $\mathbb{Z}/2^{n-k}$, so that for $k \leq n-1$, each Σ^k admits a free involution τ^k. Let X be the "line graph" with vertex set $V(X) = \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, such that $\{i, j\} \in E(X)$ whenever $|i - j| = 1$.

In this setting, the construction of Theorem 2.12 produces a 4-manifold E^4 which fibers as a surface bundle over Σ^k for each $0 \leq k \leq n$. In more detail, define $E_1^k = \Sigma \times \Sigma^k$. For $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, the graphs of f^k and $\tau^k \circ f^k$ are disjoint, and we attach E_1^k to E_1^{k+1} by joining the graph of $\tau^k \circ f^k \subset E_1^k$ to the graph of $f^{k+1} \subset E_1^{k+1}$. Although E_1^n does not necessarily admit a free involution, the vertex $n \in X$ has valence 1, and E_1^{n-1} can still be joined to E_1^n using the rule described above, resulting in a 4-manifold E_X.

For $0 \leq k \leq n$, there are fiberings $p_k : E_X \to \Sigma_k$ defined on components $E_2^j \subset E_X$ via

$$p_k|_{E_2^j} = \begin{cases} p_H^k & j = k \\ f^k \circ p_V & j \neq k \end{cases}$$

Together, these realize E_X as the total space of a surface bundle over Σ^k for each $0 \leq k \leq n$.

3. Further questions

In this final section we collect together some questions about surface bundles over surfaces with multiple fiberings. Our first line of inquiry concerns the number of possible fiberings that surface bundles over a surface with given Euler characteristic can admit.

Proposition 3.1. *Let E^4 be a 4-manifold with $\chi(E) = 4d$. Then E admits at most*[4]

$$F(d) = \sigma_0(d)(d+1)^{2d+6}$$

fiberings as a surface bundle over a surface which are distinct up to π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism, where $\sigma_0(d)$ denotes the number of divisors of d.

Proof. To obtain the explicit bound given above, we will first reproduce F.E.A. Johnson's original argument, incorporating some improvements suggested by J. Hillman. Let $p : E \to \Sigma_h$ be the projection for a Σ_g-bundle structure on E. There is an associated short exact sequence of fundamental groups

$$1 \to K \to \pi_1 E \to \pi_1 \Sigma_h \to 1, \tag{2}$$

with $K \approx \pi_1 \Sigma_g$ the fundamental group of the fiber.

We will first show that if $g < h$, then p determines the unique Σ_g-bundle structure on E, up to π_1-fiberwise diffeomorphism. Equivalently (by Proposition 2.2), it suffices to show that (2) is the unique splitting of $\pi_1 E$ as an extension of $\pi_1 \Sigma_h$ by $\pi_1 \Sigma_g$.

Suppose $p' : E \to \Sigma_h$ is a second fibering, giving rise to a short exact sequence

$$1 \to K' \to \pi_1 E \to \Sigma_h \to 1.$$

Consider the projection $p_*|_{K'}$. Suppose first that $p_*(K') = \{1\}$, or equivalently $K' \leq \ker p_* = K$. As K and K' are both isomorphic to $\pi_1 \Sigma_g$, in this case $K = K'$.

[4] In fact, an additional argument, such as the one given in section 5.2 of [Hil02], can be used to obtain the slightly better bound $\sigma_0(d)d^{2d+6}$. The bound given here is good enough for our purposes.

Suppose next that $\mathrm{Im}(p_*|_{K'})$ is nontrivial. In this case, the image $p_*(K')$ is a nontrivial finitely generated normal subgroup of the surface group $\pi_1\Sigma_h$. It is a general fact that if $N \lhd \pi_1\Sigma_h$ is any nontrivial finitely-generated normal subgroup, then N has finite index in $\pi_1\Sigma_h$ (cf Theorem 3.1 of [Riv11]). No finite-index subgroup of $\pi_1\Sigma_h$ is generated by strictly fewer than $2h$ generators. On the other hand, K' is generated by $2g$ generators by assumption. This is a contradiction, and it follows that $\mathrm{Im}(p_*|_{K'}) = \{1\}$. By the argument of the previous paragraph, this shows that necessarily $K = K'$, and so $p : E \to \Sigma_h$ is the unique Σ_g-bundle structure on E as claimed.

Returning to the general setting, suppose $p : E \to \Sigma_h$ is a Σ_g-bundle over Σ_h. As before, let $K \approx \pi_1\Sigma_g$ denote the fundamental group of the fiber. The Euler characteristic is multiplicative for fiber bundles:

$$\chi(E) = \chi(\Sigma_g)\chi(\Sigma_h) = 4(g-1)(h-1).$$

Let $d = (g-1)(h-1)$, so that $\chi(E) = 4d$. Any $d+1$-sheeted cover of Σ_h has genus $(h-1)d + h = (h-1)^2(g-1) + h$, and this quantity is strictly larger than g. Let $\tilde{\Sigma} \to \Sigma_h$ be such a cover, and let $\tilde{p} : \tilde{E} \to \tilde{\Sigma}$ denote the pullback of p along this cover. Then $\tilde{p}$ has the property that the genus of the fiber is strictly smaller than the genus of the base. By the above argument, K is the unique normal subgroup of $\pi_1\tilde{E}$ isomorphic to $\pi_1\Sigma_g$ with surface group quotient.

Let $\tilde{\alpha} : \pi_1 E \to \mathbb{Z}/(d+1)\mathbb{Z}$ be an epimorphism. If $\tilde{\alpha}(K) = 0$, then $\tilde{\alpha}$ is induced from a map $\alpha : \pi_1\Sigma_h \to \mathbb{Z}/(d+1)\mathbb{Z}$. Let $\tilde{\Sigma}$ denote the cover of Σ_h associated to α. Carrying out the construction of the previous paragraph, it follows that to each such $\tilde{\alpha}$ there is at most one Σ_g-bundle structure on E. As $\chi(\Sigma_g)$ must divide $\chi(E)$, it follows that E can be the total space of a Σ_g-bundle for only finitely many g. As $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1 E, \mathbb{Z}/(d+1)\mathbb{Z})$ is finite, this completes the portion of the argument due to F.E.A. Johnson.

Our own extremely modest contribution to Proposition 3.1 is to determine an explicit upper bound on the maximal cardinality of $\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1 E, \mathbb{Z}/(d+1)\mathbb{Z})$ over all possible surface bundles E of a fixed Euler characteristic $4d$. It follows from (2) that a surface bundle $\Sigma_g \to E \to \Sigma_h$ admits a generating set for $\pi_1 E$ of size $2g + 2h$. As g, h range over all possible pairs such that $(g-1)(h-1) = d$, the largest value of $2g + 2h$ is obtained for $g = d+1, h = 2$. This shows that any surface bundle over a surface E with $\chi(E) = 4d$ has a generating set with at most $2d + 6$ generators. It follows that

$$|\mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1 E, \mathbb{Z}/(d+1)\mathbb{Z})| \leq (d+1)^{2d+6}.$$

As noted above, for each $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(\pi_1 E, \mathbb{Z}/(d+1)\mathbb{Z})$, the corresponding cover $\tilde{E}$ has at most one Σ_g-bundle structure for each $g \geq 2$ such that $g-1$ divides d. The bound in the statement of the Proposition follows. □

We defined the function $N(d)$ in the Introduction,

$$N(d) := \max\{n \mid \text{there exists } E^4, \chi(E) \leq 4d, \text{ } E \text{ admits } n \text{ distinct surface bundle structures.}\}$$

Proposition 3.1 shows that $N(d) \leq \sigma_0(d)(d+1)^{2d+6}$. Prior to the results of this paper, the best known lower bound on $N(d)$ was $N(d) \geq 2$. Drastic improvements can be made by making use of the construction of Theorem 2.9. Let Σ be a surface of genus 3 admitting a free involution τ, and let X be the "line graph" with vertex set $V(X) = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, such that $\{i, j\} \in E(X)$ whenever $|i - j| = 1$. According to Theorem 2.9, the corresponding E_X has 2^n fiberings. For each fibering, the base has genus 3 and the fiber has genus $3n$; consequently $\chi(E_X) = 4 \cdot 2 \cdot (3n - 1)$. This shows that

$$N(6n - 2) \geq 2^n.$$

Combining this with Johnson's upper bound, we obtain

$$2^{(d+2)/6} \leq N(d) \leq \sigma_0(d)(d+1)^{2d+6}.$$

Problem 3.2. *Study the function $N(d)$. Sharpen the known upper bounds on N, and construct new examples of surface bundles over surfaces to improve the lower bounds.*

One feature of the constructions given here is that they all take place within the smooth category, and cannot be given complex or algebraic structures. Indeed, all of the monodromy representations of the constructions of Section 2 globally fix the isotopy class of a curve contained in the fiber (one of the former boundary components). H. Shiga has shown ([Shi97]) that if E is a 4-manifold with a complex structure, B a Riemann surface, and $p : E \to B$ a holomorphic map realizing E as the total space of a holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces, then the monodromy cannot globally fix the isotopy class of any curve. On the other hand, it has been shown independently by J. Hillman, M. Kapovich, and D. Kotschick (cf. Theorem 13.7 of [Hil02]) that if E and B are as above and $p : E \to B$ is a *smooth* fibration of E over B, then there exists a holomorphic map $p' : E \to B$ that realizes E as the total space of a holomorphic family of Riemann surfaces. Combining these results with the known reducibility of the monodromies of the examples in this paper, one sees that our examples cannot be given complex structures. On the other hand, the examples of Atiyah and Kodaira that admit two fiberings take place in the algebraic category, prompting the following.

Question 3.3. *Let E^4 be a complex surface that is the total space of a surface bundle over a surface $p : E \to X$. Can such an E admit three or more such fiberings? More generally, can a 4-manifold with nonzero signature admit three or more structures as a surface bundle over a surface?*

This question is closely related to a point raised briefly in the introduction, and we remark that it is possible that the list of known fiberings of a given 4-manifold need not be exhaustive. There can be "hidden" fiberings that are not immediately apparent.

Question 3.4. *Are the two known fiberings of surface bundles over surfaces of the Atiyah-Kodaira type the only surface bundle structures on these manifolds? Do the manifolds constructed*

in Section 2 admit more fiberings than described in this paper? Is there some finite-sheeted cover of an Atiyah-Kodaira manifold that admits three or more fiberings?

References

[Ati69] M. F. Atiyah. The signature of fibre-bundles. In *Global Analysis (Papers in Honor of K. Kodaira)*, pages 73–84. Univ. Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1969.

[BM12] R.I. Baykur and D. Margalit. Lefschetz fibrations and Torelli groups. Preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1210.7824.pdf, 2012.

[BM13] R.I. Baykur and D. Margalit. Indecomposable surface bundles over surfaces. *J. Topol. Anal.*, 5(2):161–181, 2013.

[FM12] B. Farb and D. Margalit. *A primer on mapping class groups*, volume 49 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.

[Hil02] J. A. Hillman. *Four-manifolds, geometries and knots*, volume 5 of *Geometry & Topology Monographs*. Geometry & Topology Publications, Coventry, 2002.

[Joh99] F. E. A. Johnson. A rigidity theorem for group extensions. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 73(2):81–89, 1999.

[Kod67] K. Kodaira. A certain type of irregular algebraic surfaces. *J. Analyse Math.*, 19:207–215, 1967.

[Mor01] S. Morita. *Geometry of characteristic classes*, volume 199 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. Translated from the 1999 Japanese original, Iwanami Series in Modern Mathematics.

[Neu76] D. Neumann. 3-manifolds fibering over S^1. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 58:353–356, 1976.

[Riv11] I. Rivin. Rigidity of fibering. Preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1106.4595v2.pdf, 2011.

[Sak12] T. Sakasai. Lagrangian mapping class groups from a group homological point of view. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 12(1):267–291, 2012.

[Sal14] N. Salter. Cup products, the Johnson homomorphism, and surface bundles over surfaces with multiple fiberings. Preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.0066, 2014.

[Shi97] H. Shiga. On monodromies of holomorphic families of Riemann surfaces and modular transformations. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 122(3):541–549, 1997.

[Thu86] W. Thurston. A norm for the homology of 3-manifolds. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 59(339):i–vi and 99–130, 1986.

[Tol69] J. Tollefson. 3-manifolds fibering over S^1 with nonunique connected fiber. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21:79–80, 1969.

E-mail address: nks@math.uchicago.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, 5734 S. University Ave., Chicago, IL 60637